the making; if the pregnancy goes unharmed, what is the end product? A dog? An elephant? No, inexorably it will be a human being.

To legalize abortion because it is safer for the mother when done by professionals is not a valid excuse. Why not legalize robbery if it is done by professional thieves?

Already this sad, shocking and nonsensical scene can be seen in some hospitals: a medicosurgical team performing a transplantation of a vital organ to a patient whose days are numbered in the hope of extending his life a few years or even only a few months, and at the same time in another room not far away, a skilled physician cutting off the roots of life in two, three or four women.

The door is now open, and it is just the beginning; in less than 30 years it can be predicted that we shall have abortion and sterilization at will, that all noxious drugs will be on the open market, that euthanasia will not only be legalized but compulsory for the mentally ill, incurables, invalids, old people and criminals (if we still have some!).

At that time, a medical student will have to choose between becoming a healer or a killer, because the work of extermination will be at least as important as healing the sick. Moreover, because of the God-like authority of physicians, people will be afraid to seek medical advice, lest they be put on the death list. Exaggeration? I doubt it.

Would new legislators have sufficient courage to put the helm hard over and restrain the downfall of our nation? I wonder.

Jules Lavoie, M.D.

St. Georges, P.Q.

Inconsistency or misunderstanding?

To the Editor:

In June of 1971, the General Council of the Canadian Medical Association agreed, albeit by a narrow vote, that there were socioeconomic reasons for abortion. The Council also agreed that the decision should be made by the woman and her doctor. Abortion was thus a social problem with medical manifestations with the doctor playing God.

In 1972 the LeDain Commission issued part of its report on drug abuse. In that report physicians were blamed for failing to meet the drug abuse problem. With characteristic inconsistency the Canadian Medical Association replied in effect "don't blame us, after all it is a social problem with medical manifestations."

With the inconsistency of the Canadian Medical Association and the immorality of some of its members, it is no wonder that the image of doctors in Canada is becoming that of a money oriented, irresponsible group. Isn't it time that we were more honest with ourselves?

Heather S. Morris, M.D.

99 Avenue Rd.,
Toronto 5, Ont.

To the Editor:

In reply to Dr. Morris's letter, it is true that The Association by a narrow vote agreed that there were socioeconomic reasons for abortion. The Association did not, however, indicate that these were the only reasons for abortion, nor did it suggest that the only or major problem was a social one "with medical manifestations". We are therefore unable to follow the reasoning which leads Dr. Morris to conclude that The Association believes that abortion is "a social problem with medical manifestations with the doctor playing God."

With respect to the report of the LeDain Commission on drug abuse, no organization in this country, be it medical or otherwise, has been more active in its attempt to meet its responsibilities. The record, as outlined in a special report published in the March 4, issue of the Journal (p. 604A) clearly documents the evidence.

It was a Joint C.M.A.—F.D.D. Committee study that publicly outlined the medical misuse of methadone and called for more stringent controls (*Can Med Assoc J* 105: 1193, 1971).

In its first submission to the LeDain Commission in November 1969, the C.M.A. outlined the problems being created by the over-prescribing and over-dispensing of stimulants and sedatives. Following considerable study, including a national survey of physicians' prescribing habits, The Association recommended more conservative use of these drugs and more stringent control by the Federal Government. These recommendations included drugs still not covered by the Government's recent regulations concerning methadone and amphetamines.

It is true that The Association has said on several occasions since the fall of 1969 that "the non-medical use of